REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application.

Claim 3 has been cancelled herein. Claims 9-23 have been newly added. No new matter is entered.

Claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claim 1, 4-8 have been amended herein to clarify the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 2 and 6-8 are found to be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. It is respectfully submitted claims 1, 2 and 6-8 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pyndiah et al. (U.S. 6,122,763). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Herzberg (U.S. 5,996,104).

Claim 3 is cancelled obviating the rejection.

Claims 4 and 5 each include at least the distinguishing feature of: the results of final decoding processing are output from said second elementary decoder directly <u>without</u> intervention of interleaving or deinterleaving.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Pyndiah nor Herzberg teach outputting the results of final decoding processing directly without intervention of interleaving or deinterleaving.

According to claims 4 and 5, since the results of final decoding processing are output directly without intervention of interleaving or deinterleaving. This distinguishing feature provides an advantage because the error pattern in the results is bursty in nature and in a case where resend control is carried out, it is more advantageous for errors to be concentrated.

12